



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,076	09/30/2003	Jeyhan Karaoguz	14275US02	5075
23446	7590	11/04/2008	EXAMINER	
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLEY, LTD			MACILWINTON, JOHN MOORE JAIN	
500 WEST MADISON STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 3400			2442	
CHICAGO, IL 60661				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***

**Application No.**

10/675,076

**Examiner**

John M. MacLwinen

**Applicant(s)**

KARAOGUZ ET AL.

**Art Unit**

2442

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-30

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
 See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/Andrew Caldwell/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues, regarding claim 1, that McKenna "does not describe, teach, or suggest that one location is commanding media to be sent from the STB 102a to 102b, or vice versa". That is, Applicant argues that McKenna does not teach:

"transferring the media from a first media processing device at a first geographic location that is remotely located from the home location to at least a second media processing device at a second geographic location that is also remotely located from the home location according to said controlling communication from said television in the home location".

However, McKenna clearly meets the above claim language, for example, in cited col. 5 lines 18 - 29, col. 6 lines 20 - 30, col. 15 line 65 - col. 16 line 23, and Fig. 1.

The "home location" of claim 1 would correspond to items 102, 104, 106 and 108, appearing on the left side of Fig. 1; that is, a user's set-top box, tv, and remote controls.

The "first media processing device at a first geographic location that is remotely located from the home location", could, in at least one embodiment, be represented by either of the "Broadcast Center's 110.

The "at least a second media processing device at a second geographic location that is remotely located from the home location", could, in at least one embodiment, be represented by the TV 104 and STB 102 on the left hand side of Fig.1.

The controlling communications from the home location would thus result in media being transmitted 'from' both Broadcast Centers 110, ultimately 'to' STB 102/TV 104 on the right side of Fig. 1.

The claim language does not prohibit the "home location" from being the originator of the claimed media.

Applicant's arguments thus are not persuasive.

Applicant also argues that the claimed "third home" of claim 27 is supported by the language "[t]ransfer of media from the first location to one or more other locations....", where the "one or more other locations" is emphasized. However, in claim 27, the "third home" is recited as where the media is "from", not where the media is "to". The "one or more other locations" emphasized by Applicant in the above location is in regard to where the media is "to". Applicant's argument thus is not persuasive.